



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,331	03/09/2000	Tipin Ben Chang	ARAX-011	3278

7590 01/27/2005
David B Ritchie
D'Alessandro & Ritchie
P O Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant(s)

09/522,331

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 17-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 17-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 08/06/2004 to the original application filed 03/09/2000.
2. Claims 7-12 and 17-31 are currently pending in this application. Claims 7, 17 and 22 are independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-12 and 17-31 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yalcinalp** (U.S. 6,507,857 – filed 03/2000, which is provisional application 60/123,916 – filed 03/1999) in view of **Lipkin** (U.S. 6,721,747 – filed 01/2001, which is provisional application No. 60/176,137 – filed 01/2000).

As to independent claim 7:

- a. Yalcinalp teaches a method for a user to interface with a workflow server (*fig. 2*), including:
- (i) accepting a task form from the user, the task form containing data tags and process tags (*e.g., receiving a request for an input document...having tags associated with the input document, wherein one of the tags presents an external component, processing tags; col.2, lines 23-48*), the data tags identifying persisted (*e.g., style sheets 220; col.5, lines 37-50*) and non-persisted data component (*e.g., a transform document; col.5, lines 37-50*);
 - (ii) passing the task form to an XML Execution Engine (*e.g., loading the external component in an style sheet processor; col.2, lines 23-67*);
 - (iii) accessing an XML namespace to determine how to execute the process tags and how to interpret the data tags (*e.g., the external component may be defined...using a Namespace; col.2, lines 23-67*);
 - (iv) executing the process tags (*e.g., When the style sheet processor processes the tags in the style sheet; col. 3, line 63-col.4, line 25*); and
 - (v) returning an XML document back to the user, the XML document containing a reference to an XSL file and containing the output of the execution of the process tags; and displaying the XML document using the XSL file (*e.g., When the style sheet is completely processed by the XSLT processor... display on the client type for the user; col.6, lines 27-43*).
- b. Yalcinalp does not explicitly teach “storing the persisted data components in one or more form data tables and accessing a database if necessary.”

Art Unit: 2176

- c. Lipkin teaches storing the persisted data components in one or more form data tables (*col.12, line 6- col. 13, line 5/col.28, lines 31-38 and col.31, line 65-col.32, line 12*) and accessing a database if necessary (*Abstract/col.12, lines 6- 64 and col.19, line 66-col.20, line 65*).
- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Lipkin in the system of Yalcinalp because Lipkin's teaching would have provided the capability for efficiently managing and retrieving information over a network.

As to dependent claim 8:

Yalcinalp teaches the accepting include accepting a user command from the user via a web browser (*Fig.2*).

As to dependent claim 9:

Yalcinalp teaches the process tags indicate one or more processes to be executed and the data tags indicate information (*col. 3, line 63-col.4, line 25*).

As to dependent claim 10:

Yalcinalp teaches the data tags and process tags are XML tags found in the XML name space (*col. 3, line 63-col.4, line 25*).

As to dependent claim 11:

Yalcinalp teaches the XSL file defines a stylesheet for displaying the returned XML document in the web browser (*col.1, lines 49-57*)

As to dependent claim 12:

Yalcinalp teaches the XML namespace contains tags which define data tables, substitute data retrieved from the database, perform workflow functions, and generate the returned XML document according to logic described in the tags (*col.5, lines 7-50*).

As to dependent claim 19:

Yalcinalp teaches the data tags include a single select type, wherein the single select type defines a set of possible values from which a user may select a single entry (*col. 3, line 63-col.4, line 25*).

As to dependent claim 20:

Yalcinalp teaches the data tags include a single select type, wherein the single select type defines a set of possible values from which a user may select multiple entries (*col. 3, line 63-col.4, line 25*).

As to dependent claim 21:

Yalcinalp teaches the data tags include a multiple column type, wherein the multiple column type defines a set of possible values from a base form data table, wherein a workflow server generates a separate column for each of the possible values from the form data table (*col. 3, line 63-col.4, line 25*).

As to independent claim 17:

It is directed to a program storage device for implementing the method of claim 7, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 18:

Yalcinalp teaches the data tags include user-defined types (*col. 3, line 63-col.4, line 25*).

As to independent claim 22:

Art Unit: 2176

It is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 7, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 23-27 and 28-31:

They include the same limitations as in claims 8-12 and 18-21, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 08/06/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that *Yalcinalp* fails to teach or suggest "accepting a task form from the user, the task form containing data tags and process tags, the tags identifying persisted and non-persisted data components." (Remarks, page 8, last para.)

In response, *Yalcinalp* teaches accepting a task form from the user, the task form containing data tags and process tags (*e.g., receiving a request for an input document...having tags associated with the input document, wherein one of the tags presents an external component, processing tags; col.2, lines 23-48*), the data tags identifying persisted (*e.g., style sheets 220; col.5, lines 37-50*) and non-persisted data component (*e.g., a transform document; col.5, lines 37-50*).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
January 24, 2005


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER